

Arizona Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee
Summary of Minutes
July 9-10, 2007

Voting Members Present:

Paul Wilson, Captain, Pima County Sheriff's Office (Co-Chair)
Mark Venuti, Director, Guardian Medical Transport (Co-Chair)
Ken Leighton-Boster, Chief, Arizona Department of Health Services
Scott Tillman, Supervising Telecom Engineer, Arizona Department of Public Safety
Pete Weaver, Emergency Manager/LEPC Coordinator, Pinal County Public Works

Voting Members Absent:

None.

PSCC Support Office Attendees:

Curt Knight, Executive Director, Public Safety Communications Commission
Jeff Miner, Project Manager, Public Safety Communications Commission
Wayne Kincheloe, Engineer II, Public Safety Communications Commission
Renee Larson, Administrative Services Officer, Public Safety Communications Commission
Evelyn Jablonski, Executive Assistant, Public Safety Communications Commission

Other Attendees:

(July 9, 2007 participants appearing in the order as taken from the ICTAP sign-in sheet.)

Jon Huish, Arizona State Forestry
Steve West, Springerville Police Department
Leon N. Wilmot, Yuma County Sheriff's Office
Joyce Raschiatore, Government Information Technology Agency
Dale Brown, Arizona State Forestry
Mike Dieffenbaugh, City of Mesa
Wes Kemp, Gilbert Fire Department
John Glorioso, Town of Gilbert
Andy Lacy, Motorola
Jesse W. Cooper, Phoenix Police Department
John Murray, Federal Engineering
Cathy Allen, Coconino County Sheriff's Office
Steve Howard, Tyco Electronics
Pete Weaver, Pinal County Emergency Management
Mark Venuti, Flagstaff Fire Department/Guardian Medical Transport
Paul Wilson, Pima County Sheriff's Office
Ken Leighton-Boster, Arizona Department of Health Services
Scott Tillman, Arizona Department of Public Safety
Mike Worrell, Phoenix Fire Department
Larry Sayers, Pima County Wireless Services
Greg Wilkinson, City of Yuma
Mark Hill, Gila River Police Department

Charlene Gustaveson, Page Police Department
Ray Varner, Page Police Department
Louise Smith, Phoenix Fire Department
Tim Singleton, Arizona Department of Health
William Fleming, Motorola
Mike Sumnicht, Motorola
Mark Bare, Motorola
Tom Florman, Coconino Sheriff's Office
Ryan Goosley, Arizona DEMA/ADEM

(July 10, 2007 participants appearing in the order as taken from the ICTAP sign-in sheet.)

Greg Wilkinson, City of Yuma
Wayne Kincheloe, Public Safety Communications Commission
Joyce Raschiatore, Government Information Technology Agency
Larry Sayers, Pima County Wireless Services
Tim Singleton, Arizona Department of Health
Robert Evans, Arizona Department of Health
Louise Smith, Phoenix Fire Department
Steve Francis, Yavapai County Sheriff's Office
Jesse Locksa, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office
Steve Howard, Tyco Electronics
Andy Miller, Arizona Department of Public Safety
Scott Tillman, Arizona Department of Public Safety
Mark Hill, Gila River Indian Community
Mark Venuti, Flagstaff Fire Department/Guardian Medical Transport
Jesse W. Cooper, Phoenix Police Department
Kathleen Robinson, Tucson Police Department
Karl Hartmetz, La Paz County Sheriff's Office
Pete Weaver, Pinal County Emergency Management
Tom Melcher, Gila County Sheriff's Office
Jeff Miner, Public Safety Communications Commission
Ryan Goosley, Arizona DEMA/ADEM
Jay Vargo, Pinal County
Mike Brashier, City of Casa Grande
Woody Dyche, Northrup Grumman
Andy Lacy, Motorola
Curt Fonger, Pinal County
Bruce McGregor, Mesa Fire Department
Mike Dieffenbaugh, Mesa Communications
Mark Bare, Motorola
William Fleming, Motorola
Michael Paz, Motorola
Leon N. Wilmot, Yuma County Sheriff's Office
John Murray, Federal Engineering
Ken Leighton-Boster, Arizona Department of Health Services

Carl Reitz, City of Peoria
Steve West, Springerville Police Department
Marcus Aurelius, Public Safety Communications Commission (commissioner)

Call to Order, Introductions and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Co-Chair Paul Wilson. Ms. Evelyn Jablonski took the roll call and a quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes from January 23, 2007

Co-Chair Wilson asked for a motion to approve the January 23, 2007 minutes. Co-Chair Mark Venuti motioned for approval of the minutes as submitted and Mr. Ken Leighton-Boster seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

General Business

Mr. Curt Knight reported a total of 80 agencies have executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to participate in the usage of the Arizona Interagency Radio System (AIRS) mutual aid channels. Co-Chair Wilson advised he submitted an MOU online to PSCC but has not heard back on the status. Ms. Renee Larson, PSCC Support Office, will follow-up and report back to the Pima County Sheriff's Office.

Briefing – PSCC/SIEC Support to Arizona Department of Homeland Security in Review of State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP) FFY 07 Grants

Mr. Knight reported ten individuals from the PSCC, SIEC and other government agencies assisted the Arizona Department of Homeland Security office per their request in reviewing interoperability grant applications for a peer review. He reported 63 projects were reviewed totaling a requested \$19.5 million and covering the five different Regional Advisory Councils (RACs) in addition to the state agencies category.

An evaluation criteria was put together by the PSCC Support Office to the Arizona Department of Homeland Security to serve as a guide in evaluating those grant requests, what those monies should be used for and some common elements for interoperability. After the grant application review, a non-binding recommendation was put forth to the Arizona Department of Homeland Security reference those applications that would/would not advance interoperability in the current environment. Mr. Knight stated some grant application requests, i.e., CAD and generator environment were not in the scope for the evaluation group to review which the peer review group declined evaluation of those application requests.

Mr. Knight suggested the SIEC or a broader version of the SIEC group may want to meet again to formalize the evaluation criteria and then publicize it in the name of the SIEC for future reference. A copy of the evaluation criteria was passed out to the five SIEC Voting Body members. Co-Chair Wilson asked what group Mr. Knight would like to have meet again to review this document. Mr. Knight suggested re-establishing the group of ten individuals who were involved in the grant review: Curt Knight, Jeff Miner, Kevin Rogers, Scott Tillman, Mike Worrell, Greg Wilkinson, Dan Wills, Greg Smith, Jay Vargo and Larry Sayers. Co-Chair Wilson reported they would bring this document back to a future meeting for approval by the

SIEC Voting Body. Mr. Knight advised if there were others interested in offering additional recommendations to contact him and a copy would be sent to them.

State Interoperability Workshop

Co-Chair Wilson reported Mr. Knight arranged for technical assistance from the Interoperable Communications Technical Assistance Program (ICTAP) to help us assemble the information for the Statewide Communications Interoperable Plan (SCIP). Mr. Knight then introduced Ms. Pat Carriveau, ICTAP Region IX Coordinator for Arizona, Nevada, and California contracted by the federal Department of Homeland Security. Ms. Carriveau served as the ICTAP facilitator of the 2-day statewide interoperability workshop session for the SIEC meeting with additional assistance provided by the following ICTAP individuals: Mr. Mike Paulette, Ms. Jennifer Hendry and Ms. Sandi Manchor. Ms. Carriveau requested those in attendance at today and tomorrow's meeting to sign the ICTAP sign-in sheet as it demonstrates to the federal level and to us here the representation of all meeting participants. Ms. Carriveau advised Ms. Manchor would be providing the note taking with assistance by Ms. Jablonski. She advised ICTAP would forward their meeting notes to Mr. Knight when completed.

Mr. Knight reported the PSCC Support Office has already begun work on the SCIP with Mr. Mike Worrell and others also providing information. He expressed today and tomorrow's workshop sessions will be a review of our draft plan with recommendations by the ICTAP staff in the areas still requiring additional information/stronger emphasis and areas missing required information. He expressed the draft plan is due to Department of Homeland Security by September 30, 2007 with the final plan due by November 1, 2007. Ms. Carriveau added they would be able to review our draft plan if submitted to ICTAP before or around September 1, 2007. She stated Arizona is only the second workshop they have conducted with their support being offered to 66 states, metropolitan areas and territories. She encouraged participation from all in attendance.

Ms. Carriveau advised the official grant guidance is due to be published around mid-July with allocations not yet determined. Ms. Jennifer Hendry briefed the Public Safety Interoperable Communications (PSIC) grant is funded by money from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) to fund investigations into the possible use of the 700 MHz frequency band for public safety and researching ways for states to build out their interoperability platforms. Ms. Hendry stated the 170 Questions to Address handout was mainly discussion/review points; however, the 45-criteria checklist items are required information that need to be covered in the plan.

Co-Chair Wilson recommended staying focused on putting the plan together and describing those investment justifications for applying those grant monies. He also emphasized the need to emerge from this with the "framework resulting in a living document" and the process for revising this document on a regular basis, describing our basic interoperability requirements, process and efforts, and Arizona's state strategy, technologies, changes, etc.

From this point forward, discussion was facilitated by ICTAP over a 2-day session with recommendations, comments and suggestions being offered to the writing of the SCIP by those in attendance.

The following comments and suggestions were provided by those in attendance after the first day meeting.

Scott Tillman – He stated pending Arizona APCO President was pushing for ICS training in general and the need for training for the dispatch community.

Ken Leighton-Boster – Suggestion made for breaking down the public health section areas into sections: Information Technology (IT) – secure, redundant systems in terms of creating all of our alerting methodology for all public health personnel statewide, satellite distribution system at every public health department/hospital/rural health clinic for redundant connectivity should they lose their normal Internet, the “M” system for daily/hourly/up-to-the-minute updates on the emergency department status throughout the state to receive patients in a timely manner, the implementation of MTRAC for patient tracking methodology for mass casualties, the HSS system for hospital beds availability, staffing at hospitals open 24 hours, emergency communications capabilities to allow maintenance of communications in the long run, review of land mobile radio MOU to the AIRS system between Arizona Department of Health Services and Department of Public Safety to create an emergency backup system for public health departments to use the existing EMSCOM UHF frequencies for tactical operational pieces.

Paul Wilson – Expressed concern that staff in the state office would be able to help with this. Suggested hiring of technical writer.

Mark Venuti – In terms of the health department, he felt the county health department, EMS Bureau of the state, and some contractual deliverables should be tied into the plan.

Pete Weaver – He felt good about getting the health aspect included. Stated he would be willing to sit down with Mr. Knight and Mr. Lou Trammell to give a local perspective to tie into the state plan.

Jesse Cooper – The focus he could provide would be towards the TICP and to local law enforcement communications in the metro area and would be willing to help out wherever needed. As the Communications Assets Survey Mapping (CASM) administrator, he felt CASM is applicable to the urban areas so he didn’t know how this would be tied into SCIP reference the CASM aspect.

Steve Howard – He mentioned the school and department of education are looking at their plans and putting their emergency response plans together in the September timeframe. He felt it would be beneficial to invite someone from their office to discuss how they work with local law enforcement, EMS and how things are escalated. Inquired about interoperability and statewide planning and questioned the data aspect. Does it include land mobile radio voice, databases and/or video?

Karl Hartmetz – He advised we have completed many of these various efforts around the state and we need to make this plan applicable to what the SCIP is requiring.

Wayne Kincheloe – He suggested the need to include power companies and schools in our discussion and to seek their input.

Woody Dyche – Suggested adding a section at the introduction of the plan stating the problem being faced by Arizona driven by interoperability with our four border state connections, the huge economic interchange and law enforcement problem due to the border issues. Mentioned

he would talk to Mr. Knight about putting some ideas together. Other topics suggested were the Grand Canyon, Glen Canyon Dam and how interoperability would fit into how public safety would respond.

Jay Vargo – He suggested there is a lot of information out there already that DEMA could provide input to the plan for reference. Division of Emergency Management has many plans and a planner to help incorporate some of the information needed.

Wayne Kamp – Suggested giving strong consideration when the plan is completed on how to market, utilize and distribute to everyone so it doesn't sit on a shelf.

Jon Huish – Suggested that it be short enough to read and light enough to carry.

Dale Brown – Offered his assistance to Mr. Knight with information as needed, i.e., maps, etc.

Joyce Raschiatore – Recommended focus be on areas that have not been addressed and other areas where information is still needed.

Mike Sumnicht – Stated this process is very involved and recognized the need to hire a technical writer to put this all together. He has seen other states hire a consultant to pull together the CASIM inventory as best they can. Another observation was how we were going to seamlessly interoperate with all federal agencies that operate in Arizona, specifically along the border. Was there a plan to address that?

Mr. Knight expressed his appreciation to all who were in attendance and for the audience participation. He advised there would be a continuation of the ICTAP workshop session tomorrow. He suggested a start time of 8:30 am scheduled for Flagstaff City Hall instead of the 9:00 am time initially posted to allow more time for discussion. The 8:30 am meeting time was agreed to. He advised if you committed to providing information to please follow through by sending to him via email or a telephone call would work.

Ms. Carriveau stated the CASIM information in relation to the plan does not have anything to do with the statewide plan but if we could reference this information as an appendix that would be helpful. She stated draft to be submitted would have to go through a body or group such as this for buy in before the review committee could look at it by September 1. She expressed her appreciation for everyone's participation.

July 10, 2007 ICTAP Workshop Session (2nd Day)

Ms. Carriveau requested all attendees to sign the sign-in sheet. She reported before the beginning of the session that all red text in the draft plan document was removed to expedite the review. She advised Ms. Hendry and Mr. Paulette would bring up the pertinent questions that needed to be addressed in the plan.

The following comments and suggestions were provided by those in attendance after the second day meeting.

Jeff Miner – Suggested we focus the document on where we want to go rather than where we are today. He was concerned that funding people would think we didn't need the money based on what we have today.

Paul Wilson – Identify funding request for investment justifications. Felt last two days were constructive. Need to still discuss the process, bring back the SIEC for another review. He expressed an appreciation for the amount of work that still needed to be done. He re-emphasized for those who committed to providing information that they would follow through.

Greg Wilkinson – Felt we were in good shape and was just a matter of putting it all together. Felt this was the best time to do this plan. If done earlier, he felt we might not have been in a position to answer these questions.

Ken Leighton-Boster – Need an appendix for some of the public health information. Felt good about the plan.

Mark Venuti – Felt good about the plan.

Scott Tillman – We are building new/refurbishing communication sites with Border Patrol, Bureau of Land Management and FBI co-located with us. Partnerships are being developed with federal, state and other counties to enhance our interoperability. Arizona's improved 700 MHz plan, submitted and approved by the Federal Communications Commission should be noted in the plan.

Steve West – The geography needs to be shown in the plan. Concern for funding issues relative to rural areas. Seek funding from legislative arena. Be careful to not be locked into just radio equipment and to be specific but broad on all types of communication.

Marcus Aurelius – He suggested strong relationships in reference to operational outcome. Recognize this is a new Plan from the federal authorities and we have to have in our planned capability passport plan. He suggested a thoughtful approach to this so we can achieve certain things for the state.

Kathleen Robinson – Data aspect is overwhelming. We should be proud of what we've done and what has been accomplished.

Mark Hill – He is new to Arizona. Impressed with our process and offered his help.

Jesse Cooper – SCIP will fit nicely with TICP. Focus on regional TICP and "marry up" with SCIP.

Mike Worrell – We are writing this for the practitioners.

Jay Vargo – Thanked PSCC for their leadership role in this.

John Murray – Felt we had made great progress with participation from all.

Summary of items that need to be addressed in draft plan as pointed out by Ms. Hendry:

1. Need cover page, executive summary and table of contents, distribution/security statement and point of contact.
2. Introduction material was discussed with suggestions for improvement. Didn't notice any criteria that was totally missing. Good information.
3. Include a problem definition and possible solutions to address the challenges identified in achieving interoperability within the SAFECOM Interoperability Continuum. What is being faced by Arizona? Information was not clearly addressed in the document. Need to clearly define.
4. Scope and time frame – This section had good solid information.
5. Provide strategic plan for coordination with neighboring states. If applicable, include a plan for coordinating with neighboring countries. This is a huge one for Arizona relative to border with several states and Mexico. Layout strategy for interoperating across borders and interoperating with our border partners should they enter our territory. Need detailed

information. Ms. Carriveau advised we might want to contact the Four Corners Group regarding a tactical plan that was being discussed by New Mexico reference interactions with bordering states. Ms. Hendry added this is happening with our peers in other states and we might want to consider talking with them for ideas of doing things. Don't re-invent the wheel. Example: Greg Wilkinson is working with San Diego and Imperial Valley. Ms. Hendry stated there are no requirements these items need be in place by November 1 but we should be aware of and address how we plan to meet this criteria.

6. Strategic plan for data interoperability and strategic plan for catastrophic loss? This was discussed but not much information in our plan.
7. Describe how plan is/will become NIMS and National Response Plan compliant? There was discussion on responder training and SOPs but not much discussion on how this plan was NIMS compliant.
8. Describe the strategy for communications interoperability with transit (inner city bus service, ports and passenger rail service, etc.). This was not addressed at all in the plan. Any plans that we have with those entities should be addressed in the plan.
9. Describe process for periodic review of interoperability plan. Not addressed but appeared we had a good idea of how to address this.
10. Specifically state the methodology by which the multi-jurisdictional/multi-discipline input was provided from all regions of the state. If people not listed, show the agencies. The plan touches on this indirectly but is not specifically stated.
11. Describe how TICP's are incorporated into the statewide Plan. It was acknowledged they exist but is not really discussed or addressed.
12. Describe strategy for implementing all components of the statewide plan. This was not clearly brought out and should be addressed.
13. Provide an overview of the governance structure. Appears to be a cut and paste insert.
14. Provide a charter for governing body or reference to the charter. It was discussed but was not provided. Criteria 4.3.
15. Provide meeting schedule for governing body.
16. Discussion of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and signers of MOU is evident but is not included in the draft. Need to address who has signed, who is still needed and where is this process going? (Criteria 4.6.)
17. Technology – need substantial information and build out of this section. Currently there is nothing in the document. (See Criteria 5.1 – 5.2.2)
18. Standard Operating Procedures – No current assessment of SOPs in the plan. All criteria 6.1 – 6.4 needs to be addressed in the plan.
19. Section 7 series – Training/Exercises is a cut and paste from Missouri plan. Need to customize to Arizona plan to fit our state needs.
20. Plan for ensuring regular usage of SOPs. (Criteria 8.1)
21. Funding – (See Criteria 9.1-9.2)
22. Implementation – Short and long-terms goals are discussed but not prioritized. Place in priority order. (Criteria 10.1)
23. No discussion of performance measurements. (Criteria 10.2)
24. Describe plan for educating policy makers. Describe the role for involving all the agencies. Information is not currently present in the plan. (Criteria 10.3-10.4)

25. Establishing plan for identifying, developing and overseeing operational requirements, SOPs, training, technical solutions, and short and long-term funding sources, etc. This information is not currently in the plan. (Criteria 10.5)
26. Describe critical success factors for implementation of the plan. This was discussed but not identified in the plan. (Criteria 10.7)

See Appendix A for ICTAP Workshop Feedback Report dated July 16, 2007.

Mr. Knight suggested the need for technical assistance with the investment justifications and asked about ICTAP's ability to support that request. Ms. Carriveau stated PSSC's technical assistance request was already in and ICTAP was waiting to see how they could help. He inquired about the summary notes being posted to the website and to the audience here. Ms. Carriveau advised when the notes were completed they would be sent to Mr. Knight and were ours to use for our purposes.

Mr. Knight questioned the September 1 date for review by ICTAP before it was submitted to the federal Department of Homeland Security by September 30. Ms. Hendry advised PSSC is one of 56 that will be reviewed so the sooner we could submit our plan the better, preferably before September 1. The turnaround time for ICTAP review would be dependent on their workload. She advised her review was to ensure the 45-criteria checkpoints were addressed and that Arizona's review should be to see if the plan met our needs and requirements. Mr. Knight felt the main two groups that would be part of our review process would be the SIEC and PSSC. He suggested maybe posting the plan on the website on a regular basis as completed different stages of the plan. Co-Chair Wilson suggested a 3-layer review process with ICTAP, SIEC and then PSSC review.

Mr. Knight expressed his appreciation to Ms. Carriveau and ICTAP staff for conducting the workshop session and his appreciation for the audience participation. He reminded those who committed to supplying information to submit it within the next two weeks.

Mr. David Felix expressed his appreciation to ICTAP for the initial kickoff meeting a couple of weeks ago and to those who were able to adjust their schedules to be able to attend this 2-day session. Mr. Felix recapped the 2-day session by expressing his appreciation to the ICTAP staff for their technical assistance in review of our statewide plan. He stated we need to have a clear vision of where we are going for the future and continue to foster partnerships specifically emphasizing those partnerships with federal agencies and stakeholders in general. He thanked the SIEC members for taking this project on for the PSSC and the state.

Mr. Felix emphasized this was critical to the Governor's Office and people at the Legislature recognize the importance of this with their support and are waiting to see how this will get funded to move this forward. He felt the timing was good with the funding opportunity it brings to the state.

Mr. Felix requested to set a date in the near future for a telephonic meeting for a one agenda item to seek recommendation for approval of the plan by the SIEC and then submitting it to the PSCC for their approval.

Co-Chair Wilson advised before we send the document to federal Department of Homeland Security (DHS) we need to have a review from stakeholders with a statement that comments would be accepted until a given date, approval by SIEC/PSCC members and then to federal DHS for their review. The dates of August 24 and 25 were suggested as possible dates for SIEC/PSCC review; however, dates were not finalized.

Date – Time – Location of Next Meeting

October 23, 2007, 10:00 a.m.
City of Peoria Municipal Complex
(Council Chambers Building)
8401 West Monroe Street
Peoria, Arizona

Call to Public

No comments were made.

Recommendations for Future Meetings

No comments were made.

Adjournment

Co-Chair Wilson called for a motion to adjourn. A first and second motion was made and carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 12:10 a.m.



APPENDIX A



July 16, 2007

Mr. Curt Knight
Arizona Department of Public Safety
Executive Director, Public Safety Communications Commission

Mr. Knight,

Please find attached the ICTAP Workshop Feedback Report from the recent Arizona Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) Workshop conducted on July 9-10, 2007. This workshop was provided in response to your ICTAP Technical Assistance request (TA-0062) dated April 19, 2007.

The ICTAP Workshop attendees have noted some items for your further consideration and these items have been documented in the attached worksheet. Additionally, future drafts of your SCIP may want to address the following areas of note:

- While the workshop attendees identified a large amount of the information needed to complete the document, that information has yet to be integrated into this SCIP draft. Consider focusing short-term efforts toward collecting and integrating those data sources into the SCIP.
- Arizona has gone to great lengths to encourage SCIP participation from all government levels. Continue your progress toward creating a truly statewide SCIP by cultivating the new and continued participation of local, tribal, state, federal, and non-governmental entities.
- As official guidance has not yet been released, the current Arizona SCIP does not address PSIC funding or strategic planning issues. Consider incorporating PSIC information as guidance becomes available.

If you would like future assistance reviewing your SCIP, ICTAP is pleased to offer an additional review of your document prior to submission to DHS. In order to best serve Arizona and other states across the nation, we would ask that you submit this draft for review in as timely a manner as possible, preferably within three weeks after your workshop date. If you would like to schedule a review, please contact your ICTAP Regional Coordinator, Pat Cariveau at 408-489-1668, pveau@pacbell.net.

Thank you in advance for your efforts and dedication to this task.

Sincerely,

ICTAP SCIP Review Team

APPENDIX A



Prepared for the State of Arizona

ICTAP-AZ-WRKSHPRPT-001-R0

July 16, 2007

Arizona Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan Workshop Feedback Report

Further distribution authorization requests shall be referred to the Commanding Officer, Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center, San Diego, Code 2855, San Diego, CA: December 2004, or higher DoD Authority.

Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) Workshop Feedback Report

According to Section I.C.5 of the 2006 Homeland Security Grant Program, each state is required to develop and adopt a Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP). To assist in this process and to ensure all states include essential components, the Department of Homeland Security's SAFECOM program has identified the necessary criteria for a communications interoperability plan. Criteria are organized by 10 major components of a statewide interoperability plan: background and preliminary steps; strategy; methodology; governance; technology; SOPs; training and exercises; usage; funding; and implementation.¹

The Interoperable Communications Technical Assistance Program (ICTAP) has been tasked to provide technical assistance and expertise on request to states as they develop their SCIP. In this advisory capacity, ICTAP has developed a SCIP Workshop designed to aid states as they move forward with their statewide strategic planning processes.

States should prepare a SCIP development timeline that allows for the submission of a draft to DHS by September 30, 2007. States should also be prepared to submit their final SCIP document to DHS by November 1, 2007.²

¹ The previous paragraph is derived in part from the SAFECOM website at:
http://www.safecomprogram.gov/SAFECOM/library/grant/1304_fy2007.htm

² For further information, please see: http://www.ntia.doc.gov/otiahome/dtv/DTV_PSICFAQ.htm

APPENDIX A

SCIP Workshop

The Arizona SCIP Workshop was held on July 9-10, 2007. The following agencies were in attendance:

- Arizona PSCC
- Arizona DEMA/ADEM
- Arizona Dept of Health
- Arizona Dept of Public Safety
- Arizona DPS/PSCC
- Arizona State Forestry
- City of Casa Grande
- City of Mesa
- City of Peoria
- City of Yuma AZ
- Coconino County Sheriff's Office
- Coconino Sheriff's Office
- Federal Engineering
- Flagstaff FD/Guardian Medical
- Gilbert Fire Dept
- Gila County Sheriff's Office
- Gila River Police Dept
- GITA
- La Paz County Sheriff
- Maricopa County Sheriff Office
- Mesa Fire Dept
- Motorola
- Northrop Grumman
- Page Police Department
- Phoenix Fire Dept
- Phoenix Police Dept
- Pima County Sheriff's Dept
- Pima County Wireless Services
- Pinal County
- Pinal County Emergency Mgmt.
(AESAs President)
- PSCC
- PSCC.CRAC
- Springerville Police Dept
- Town of Gilbert
- Tucson Police Department
- Tyco Electronics
- Yavapai County Sheriff's Office
- Yuma Co. Sheriff's Office

Statewide Communications Interoperability Plan (SCIP) Workshop Comments

The Workshop Feedback Report contains comments, suggestions, discussion points, and other input captured during participant discussions at the workshop. SCIP authors and committee members are encouraged to read through the comments provided. They may then use their discretion when deciding whether or not to incorporate this feedback into their SCIP.

The Feedback Report contains SAFECOM-recommended SCIP components and criteria for inclusion in the completed document. The Feedback Report also includes the notes and input garnered during the Workshop that relate to each component or criteria.

APPENDIX A

Arizona SCIP Workshop Comments

Workshop Date: July 9, 2007 – July 10, 2007

Cover Page

Cover page is present. Cover page clearly identifies the title, ownership, and distribution limitations of the document.

- No Cover page included

Executive Summary

Executive Summary is present and no more than 2-3 pgs in length.

- No Executive Summary included

Table of Contents

Table of Contents is present and accurately reflects the location of content in the document.

- No Table of Contents included

Statewide Plan Criteria

1 Background and Preliminary Steps

1.1 State Overview

Criteria 1.1: Provide an overview and background information on the state and its regions. Include geographic and demographic information.

- 1st paragraph should be adjusted as it mentions Colorado twice (awkward).
- Border information, although important, seems out of place here, especially as it comes before descriptions of the state, its populace, etc.
- Consider re-structuring this “Regions, Geography, Size, Major Roadways and Waterways, Climate, Geographical Considerations” introduction section more into discrete segments on state structure, population/demographic information, geography/topography information, natural threat assessment, man-made threat assessment, border issues, etc and better integrating the information here with the more discrete section information below. As written now, the intro feels like a “cut and paste data dump” from many sources, jumping around from topic to topic with no clear thesis or path.

APPENDIX A

- Much of AZ is federal, state or tribal land...as such, that set-up is worthy of discussion. There is a lot of federal land in AZ that have specific needs with regards to federal/state/tribal interoperability. Consider adding a map regarding land ownership.
- Discussion during the workshop that it feels more like a "tourism brochure" than a plan introduction.
- Note: Pima County is becoming a 2nd UASI area and should be mentioned as such.
- An attendee brought a substantial list of other issues/concerns to address in the threat assessment/introduction to the Arizona SCIP including (but not limited to): agriculture, banking (Federal Reserve cash processing center, etc.), business, commercial and chemical facilities, energy, nuclear reactors, IT communications, gaming, transportation, military bases, agriculture, food, call data centers, defense industry, public health, drinking water system, waste water system, dams, Tribal/border areas, highways, government facilities, etc. She stated that the state may have existing documents that describe these potential risks. Also, any of these areas that do not requiring improvement should be called out in the strategic plan.
- A suggestion was made to include a multi-layer map addressing states and counties.
- If any of this material is, in fact, taken from other sources, ICTAP would also strongly suggest citing those sources appropriately.
- Consider including any known numerical information for your emergency response agencies section...it's wise to include statements regarding the industry's growth but more concrete information regarding the industry's current (and projected) size would be beneficial. The Arizona Fire Chief's Assoc., P.O.S.T., the state DHS & the Dept. of Health Services were suggested as sources for this information.
- CAP canal should likely be mentioned.
- Suggest emphasizing value (and limited alternate routes) to the interstate systems.
- Consider adding such large-venue events as the NASCAR races (Phoenix International Raceway seats 76,000 fans).
- Mention involvement in TOPOFF-4.
- Region maps are included but no legend or description of the value of the maps is provided. Committee mentioned that there is expansion needed. Committee also suggested including one or more introductory paragraphs. May want to include a tribal statement in this section. Suggested leaving one key map and moving rest to an appendix. Consider including UASI boundary map.
- Discussion regarding any primary hazards that have not yet been addressed...the committee was asked to provide any input on these events to the document. La Paz County (Quartzite area specifically) reported a significant impact of hundreds of thousands of folks in motor homes on federal land seasonally (the "influx of the snowbirds."). An ad hoc solution with BLM is in place now but could be improved. Pinal County reported other concerns such as the I-10 corridor, the border concerns, etc. Decision made to email these types of issues to Curt Knight for inclusion in the document.

APPENDIX A

- Discussion regarding the distribution of the plans and how freely they are to be made available regarding the freedom of information act, etc. Need to determine a distribution plan and a central point of contact. Expanded discussion on how the Phoenix UASI exacted this document control both after completion and during the draft review/building period. No formal process was defined but a request was made to develop a firm security statement and include it on the plan cover page. May consider “public safety sensitive” or “For Official Use Only” (which has other implications).

1.2 UASI Areas/Tic Plans

Criteria 1.6: Identify any Tactical Interoperability Communications Plans (TICP) in the state.

- Identifies the Phoenix TIC Plan in a table...may want to incorporate a paragraph-form discussion of the content/value of the TIC Plan toward SCIP planning efforts. May want to discuss strategic plans to expand the Phoenix TIC Plan into a statewide tactical plan (as opposed to this strategic plan).
- May want to identify the Tucson TIC Plan as planned but not currently in existence. POC may be Kerry Reeve (kerry.reeve@pima.gov) or Larry Sayers.
- Future plans for TICPs: Phoenix UASI was put together with hopes of being statewide. More emphasis from state perspective than tactical plans throughout Arizona. Might want to take time to think through how big this plan should be and how much detail is needed, thought process on how to approach it. Long range, could ask for ITCAP assistance to regionalize TICPs. Deferred at this time until state plans are complete. Suggest deciding on short-term, mid-term and long-term plans.

1.3 Participating Agencies and POCs

Criteria 1.2: List all agencies and organizations that participated in developing the plan.

- Included. May wish to expand involvement further to get more representation across the state (participation at the workshop was much more inclusive than is documented here).

1.4 Statewide Plan POC

Criteria: 1.3. Identify the point of contact. DHS expects that each state will have a full time interoperability coordinator. The coordinator should not represent or be affiliated with any one particular agency and should not have to balance the coordinator duties with other responsibilities.

- Designated as Mr. Curt Knight. He is not, however, a full-time interoperability coordinator; the state does not have one.

1.5 Scope and Timeframe

Criteria 1.7: Set the scope and timeframe of the plan.

- Includes solid information.

APPENDIX A

2 Methodology

Criteria 3.1: Describe the method by which multi-jurisdictional, multi-disciplinary input was provided from all regions of the state.

- Still needs to be addressed – p. 21 of the current draft covers some of this.

Criteria 3.2: Define the process for continuing to have local input and for building local support of the plan.

- May want to address how non-governmental organizations and tribal entities were/will be represented or how their needs/inputs will be brought to the group. For example, an outreach program to the tribal entities is in place and has varying levels of success over the years.
- Significant discussion regarding how to best address interoperability with private organizations. Could be via MOU with the state onto the state AIRS system, could be a seat at the EOC, could be an input vehicle just to get business concerns into the committee, etc. Worthy of future discussions. Good discussion within the group as to whether or not this fits within the scope of this plan.
- May want to include a reference to the existing state plan.

Criteria 3.3: Describe how the TICPs were incorporated into the statewide plan.

- This criteria is not clearly addressed in this draft.
- May want to include a statement that the TIC Plan is a repository for current COML contact information.

Criteria 3.4: Describe the strategy for implementing all components of the statewide plan.

- This criteria is not clearly addressed in this draft.

3 Current Statewide Assessment

Criteria 1.4: Describe the communications and interoperability environment of the current emergency response effort.

- Consider adding a discrete section on PSCC activities with the SIEC as a sub-group. Suggestion made to note the type of representation (may be best fit in the governance section).
- Discussing the current status of interoperability, is the future goal of AIRS to cover the majority of the population of AZ? Majority of the geographical space? Majority of public safety responders? Probably best to define projected coverage and usage goals. Committee stated that the goal is street level, not building penetration, interoperable coverage. In-building interoperability should be addressed as a part of the long-term goals.
- Describe in further detail why basic interoperability is not believed to be sufficient to meet the current and projected operational needs of the state. Describe why near-term actions deter from long term actions...the more explanation and clear statements regarding the problem, the more intuitive the reader's understanding of how the solution will apply to that problem.

APPENDIX A

- Suggest bulleting the list of trunked 800 MHz sites for ease of reading.
- What makes the location of the mobile vehicles strategically sound? Response time? Coverage?
- Formal and informal agreements mentioned here should be included elsewhere in the document (e.g. as appendices and referenced in text).
- Suggest writing out acronyms the first time they appear in the document (e.g. EOC, MCC, NIMS, ICS, DEMA, etc.). Consider adding a glossary as an appendix.
- Is the state EOC activated in ALL cases where a state response is involved? Smaller events as well (state patrol mutual aid calls, state-assisted investigations, etc.)).
- Does the EOC staffing structure “mirror” NIMS/ICS or is it consistent and adherent to NIMS/ICS? Slightly different meaning that could be misinterpreted.
- Why only call out the resource unit leader in this text? What other positions are important to note?
- 3rd paragraph under section 2.1.1 is confusing and redundantly worded...are the 5 regions the same as the Homeland Defense Regions? What is the primary contact point? The central dispatch center or the incident-owning jurisdiction/agency? Are MOUs etc. in place that give the local agency officials the authority to task state resources once on-scene?
- Is AZ in the process of meeting NIMS compliance requirements or are they met? Due date is Sept 2007 so the question was raised in the meeting as to how close the state is to completing this requirement. Note that the statewide adoption of plain language is only during interoperable events and is not required for day-to-day operable communications.
- Good start on a discussion concerning how the state will support the local agencies. However, the plan should read less like a “state” plan and more like a “statewide” plan meaning it should discuss how all entities will support each other (going both directions).
- Paragraph on fire management may be unnecessary or misplaced.
- Are there statewide Emergency Operations Plans Communications Annexes that might have fitting info (or a good reference here)?
- Consider any applications from the 2004 macro report to this section. Consider any information from CASM (i.e. populated in the Phoenix area) that may apply here. Note that CASM information may not be feasible for inclusion in the plan – CASM training for the state and for the Phoenix UASI has not yet been scheduled.
- Suggest beefing up and expanding on defining processes, describe TICP incorporation, method of implementing strategy – by committee or by vote? Might be area to address non-governmental and tribal and how they are incorporated. There are some outreach programs to tribal level – might want to elaborate on this. Doesn’t need to be technology or how are you going to get their input/things they/you need to know, i.e. communications. Include busses, utilities, and planes. Private areas might need to be identified and included in plan – how will they all interface? Critical infrastructure has been addressed, but not sure about other areas.
- From the standpoint of creating an Interoperability plan dealing with communications, the committee engaged in substantial discussions regarding how (or if) to best integrate the interests,

APPENDIX A

inputs, and needs of non-governmental organizations, businesses, and agencies. Suggestions were made to have private entities have a seat on the EOC for part of the communication/discussion process, to mention that there has been some activity addressing private sector communication, to suggest that industries have an MOU allowing them to use AIRS, etc.

- Suggested by group: Reference Macro-Study from July 04 – Interviews were conducted in this study. Done to formulate statewide communications plan.
- Suggest discussing what is not working well, what are the big holes, what's so wrong today, where do you not have coverage or communication. Group again suggested using the Macro-Study. Suggest using an incident that went badly or had significant operational difficulties to come up with some ideas.
- RAC – Regional Area Committee might want to be expanded upon specifically for bridging from statewide to local organization. (Southern Region).

3.1 Governance Structure

Criteria 4.1: Identify the executive or legislative authority for the governing body of the interoperability effort.

- PSCC and the SIEC are identified.
- Is there a place in the document for a better discussion of the RACs in each Homeland Security Region? Consider describing their broad jurisdictional and organizational distribution that draws in the locals to represent the RAC as a whole.
- Suggest including additional operational policies or expanding on existing ones.

Criteria 4.2: Provide an overview of the governance structure that will oversee development and implementation of the plan. Illustrate how it is representative of all of the relevant emergency response disciplines and regions in the state.

- Currently a cut-and-paste insert, needs to be customized for the SCIP and reformatted to appear properly in the document.
- Suggest including additional operational policies or expanding on existing ones.

Criteria 4.3: Provide the charter for the governing body, and use the charter to state the principles, roles, responsibilities, and processes

- Charter not provided in document.

Criteria 4.4: Identify the members of the governing body and any of its committees.

- Org. chart may be a good graphic to include here. Suggest leaving the website in the plan (to allow the interested reader to get more detail).
- Discussion to add the current make-up of the committee (by position, not by name) as a summary for the reader

Criteria 4.5: Provide a meeting schedule for the governing body.

APPENDIX A

- This criteria is not addressed in this draft.

Criteria 4.6: Describe multi-jurisdictional, multi-disciplinary agreements needed for decision-making and for sharing resources.

- Discussion the room: MOUs and the signers of those documents but not currently included in this draft.

3.2 Technology

Criteria 5.1: Include a statewide capabilities assessment or a plan for one, of the communications equipment available and related issues. (This might include radio systems, backbone and infrastructure systems, data and incident management systems, operational environment, and concerns and challenges). Use the Communications Asset Survey and Mapping (CASM) tool to conduct this assessment.

- This criteria is not addressed in this draft.

Criteria 5.2: Describe plans for continuing support of legacy systems, and developing interfaces among disparate systems, while migrating to newer technologies

- This criteria is not addressed in this draft.

Criteria 5.2.1: Describe the migration plan for moving from existing technologies to newly procured technologies.

- This criteria is not addressed in this draft.

Criteria 5.2.2: Describe the process that will be used to ensure that new purchases comply with the statewide plan, while generally allowing existing equipment to serve out its useful life.

4 This criteria is not addressed in this draft.

4.1 Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)

Criteria 6.1: Include an assessment of current local, regional, and state operating procedures which support interoperability.

- This set of criteria is not currently addressed in this plan.
- The committee did discuss that many SOPs and other agreements do in fact exist but have not been synopsized in this draft. The assessment of SOPs is part of the operational subcommittee of the SIEC but that subcommittee has not currently been tasked to compile the information for this criteria.
- Group suggested: include AIRS SOP, programming guide, and Arizona Fire FOG. Suggested including UASI FOG book when it becomes available.
- Fire had question about NIMS: is it necessary to include all ICS forms? Answer is no, but it's important to understand what information needs to be pushed up. Could state plan make broad statements regarding NIMS – when people might be trained, who might be trained, attempted

APPENDIX A

timelines? Not necessarily, but put in information about “ongoing effort”, reference as noted in the Phoenix scorecard. Suggest mirroring statements in scorecard and putting information about the communications unit leader. Suggest putting in that you are continuing to address the issues.

- Suggest elaborating on how this plan flows into NIMS plans and national response plan. Emphasize state plan is building on TICPs. Group said: Operational subcommittee addresses SOPs.
- Question: What level are we looking at here? High level of communication – who would COML, call center talk to?

Criteria 6.2: Define the process by which the state, regions, and localities will develop, manage, maintain, upgrade, and communicate standard operating procedures (SOPs), as appropriate.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this plan.

Criteria 6.3: Identify the agencies included in the development of the SOPs, and the agencies expected to comply with the SOPs.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this plan.

Criteria 6.4: Demonstrate how the SOPs are NIMS-compliant in terms of the Incident Command System (ICS) and preparedness.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this plan.

4.2 Training and Exercises

Criteria 7.1: Define the process by which the state will develop, manage, maintain and upgrade, or coordinate as appropriate, a statewide training and exercise program.

- Current information is a place holder of information taken from a Missouri plan and inserted by AZ officials, but there is no customization for AZ needs.
- As written, is a vague description of training needs but a concrete strategy or steps to take in order to implement that strategy. The strategy statements need to be revised to be AZ-specific and to remove the already past deadlines.
- Discussion of the presence of a statewide training coordinator and how best to collect information for this section from her.
- Discussion of posting section assignments to specific committee members on the group's website.
- One suggestion was to include details about the annual Dice Exercise (military, federal, state, local, national guard, etc.) at Fort Huachuca (federal testing center for interoperable hardware).
- Curt received an email with additional thoughts from some members. Suggest including training positions that are already filled to be included in this document. Recommended that information from website be added. Also add existing and future training.
- Might want to make a reference to NIMS training here.

APPENDIX A

Criteria 7.2: Describe the process for offering and requiring training and exercises, as well as any certification that will be needed.

- Current information is a place holder of information taken from a Missouri plan and inserted by AZ officials, but there is no customization for AZ needs.

Criteria 7.3: Explain how the process ensures that training is cross-disciplinary.

- Current information is a place holder of information taken from a Missouri plan and inserted by AZ officials, but there is no customization for AZ needs
- Consider including details of a statewide exercise planning workshop. Consider including a reference to the statewide exercise calendar posted on-line.
- Do you have a Civil Support Team? How often are you interacting with them/training with them? Can you increase the frequency of that interaction?

4.3 Usage

Criteria 8.1: Describe the plan for ensuring regular usage of the relevant equipment and the SOPs needed to improve interoperability.

- Current information is a place holder of information taken from a Missouri plan and inserted by AZ officials, but there is no customization for AZ needs
- May look to the AIRS system for a mission-type statement. May also want to include applicable examples (specific cases, TOPOFF, etc.).
- Consider incorporating information on more than just the AIRS interoperable solution...what other interoperable equipment is in place (mobile gateways? VTAC/UTAC? Mobile vehicles, etc.)? How can you ensure regular usage of that equipment? Monthly tests? Information regarding the current SOPs and usage information for these pieces of equipment should be detailed here.
- Suggested to the group that they focus on including specifics in this portion of the plan in addition to making adaptations to the Missouri approach. Suggested making the goals, objectives, and strategies actionable...change words like "require" to "promote" unless a specific consequence (and the authority to issue that consequence) is in place, provide specific details as to "how" these strategies will be implemented, etc.
- Group suggested putting AIRS usage and examples in this area. Usage will vary by region. Establish baseline communication system and where you want to go from here. What are you using now, how will you enhance it? Group suggested putting description of AIRS and where it is going. Focus on AIRS recommendations, use of daily equipment. Find commonalities for usage (long term). ITAC, UTAC, VTAC are used, AIRS ties everything together. Suggest showing how these are being used daily. Scott Tillman: might want to include exercise in Fort Huachuca since it includes Federal to local agencies. Will use events that are ongoing. Instead of using the word require use promote or encourage, via what mechanism. Might want to make it communication focused.

APPENDIX A

5 Strategy

5.1 Vision/Mission/Goals and Objectives

Criteria 1.5: Include a problem definition and possible solutions that address the challenges identified in achieving interoperability within the SAFECOM Interoperability Continuum.

- This criteria is not clearly addressed in this draft. Committee will use a 2004 macro report to address this criteria, at least in part.

Criteria 2.1: Describe the strategic vision, goals, and objectives for improving emergency response interagency wireless communications statewide, including how they connect with existing plans within the state.

- Mission statement appears to be for the PSCC rather than for the strategic interoperable plan. The group discussed that these missions may be one in the same, may dovetail with one another, and/or may need to have a slightly different slant. Mission for strategy equals mission for establishing board. Call out what you are trying to build here and what you don't have. Flow can be checked.
- Further suggestion to incorporate the CONOPS here and then build out the discussion as the document continues (as a "living document"). Might want to look at where more emphasis or attention is needed. Highly recommended to use what is already in place. Refer to other entities, don't make it narrow.
- Specific discussions on how these issues connect with other existing plans are not readily apparent in this draft.
- Short term – Bullets came from CONOPS. There is a timeline. Are there any that are not addressed?
- Long term – There is a timeline that goes with this. Can be incorporated here as a graph or just verbalized. Suggested develop and maintain additional support – what are the steps. Government and ownership model is part of this.
- Can list CONOPS, test bed that shows where you are going – what progress has been made. Show successes. Group suggests some flexibility to adjusting the plan – address future considerations i.e., administrative changes, Congressional funding insight to future changes. Recognize that these types of things can occur. As program transitions, there may be changes in priorities, funding sources, technology. Might want to set plateaus. Clear cut steps need to be in place because reliability of funding sources may not be there.
- Include strategies for philosophy of document – TICPs included as an appendix later, document becomes less of a security issue if other docs are referenced. State strategies for accomplishing things such as TICPs for other areas within the state then refer to documents. Include seeking technical assistance as part of strategy area.

5.2 Strategic Initiatives

Criteria 2.2: Provide a strategic plan for coordination with neighboring states. If applicable, include a plan for coordination with neighboring countries.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this draft.
- Given the number of state borders, and the presence of the international border with Mexico, this criteria appears to be key to the strategic development of interoperable communications for Arizona. This may be where you want to mention the “Four Corners” group (NM, CO, AZ, UT and tribal entities), even if the effort is in its early stages. Define what the group wants to accomplish.

Criteria 2.3: Provide a strategic plan for addressing data interoperability in addition to voice interoperability.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this draft.
- Group suggested coming up with an initial process for addressing data – state goals, brief objective and how it might be approached. Option of how FCC data applies to state.

Criteria 2.4: Describe a strategy for addressing catastrophic loss of communication assets by developing redundancies in the communications interoperability plan.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this draft.
- The group discussed that multiple levels of interoperability exist and can be used to provide redundancy, if required. Additional discussion of the microwave solution was encouraged by the group in this section. Possible to include redundancies in system here, i.e. AIRS, large regional systems that are continuing to evolve and grow, microwave (helps further long-term goals, facilitate tying other levels of redundancy together). Continue to expand upon redundancies. Reference loop-configuration of microwave here.
- There may also need to be a discussion of some of the protection factors surrounding the communications systems in the state that reduce the chances for a catastrophic loss.
- Suggested including a discussion of the strategic plan to allow the 3 major communications centers to “take over” for other centers with regard to interoperability (with virtually no loss of service) in the event of a catastrophic loss.
- Additional suggestion to include discussion of the satellite phones currently being inserted into communications centers, EOCs, hospitals, etc. ? Satellite communications is possible for redundancy. Satellite phones exist in dispatch centers, EOCs, hospitals... these are documented and tested monthly in the hospitals. Are they tested elsewhere?
- Include what types of interoperable communications is currently available. Suggest referencing the funding strategy which is in section 7 of the SCIP after "Assuming continued funding...."
- Group suggested putting short-term strategy in this area. Show short-term connection. Possible to put some verbiage in here on the “big picture” making it generic.

APPENDIX A

5.3 National Incident Management System (NIMS) Compliance

Criteria 2.5: Describe how the plan is, or will become, compliant with the National Incident Management System (NIMS) and the National Response Plan.

- Specifics on how this plan is NIMS compliant is not provided in this draft.
- Committee noted that ICS/NIMS is a current weakness in the state. There is an on-going effort to better incorporate ICS/NIMS in operations, exercises, etc.
- Discussion of perhaps doing a staged approach regarding future NIMS compliance. Documentation already exists that can be summarized here. Suggest mention additional NIMS training.

Criteria 2.6: Describe a strategy for addressing communications interoperability with the safety and security elements of the major transit systems, intercity bus service providers, ports, and passenger rail operations within the state.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this draft

5.4 Review and Update Process

Criteria 2.7: Describe the process for periodic review and revision of the state plan.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this draft.
- Suggested a required annual review by the PSCC or SIEC where input is provided to the review via the SCIP point of contact. Additional reviews are optional as the need arises (significant events requiring a change in strategy, equipment acquisition, goal accomplishment, funding change, etc.)
- Include specific dates for reviews and updates, ownership, processes, change logs. Requested if there was a model that could be used here. If a process is already in place, might be able to customize it for this document. Changes would be more of reporting process unless you find your strategy is wrong. Might need to be re-thought. Suggested to document annually with additional reviews if needed. Suggest if problem or initiative, resolution might be driven by funds. Coordinate reviews with funding cycles.

6 Implementation

Criteria 10.1: Describe the prioritized action plan with short- and long-term goals for achieving the objectives.

- Short- and long-term goals are discussed but not visually prioritized.
- Group acknowledgement that this section should detail the specific actions that need to be taken to implement the above described strategy.

Criteria 10.2: Describe the performance measures that will allow policy makers to track the progress and success of initiatives.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this draft

APPENDIX A

Criteria 10.3: Describe the plan for educating policy makers and practitioners on interoperability goals and initiatives.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this draft.
- Some discussion during the workshop on “road shows” throughout the state that may apply here. Possible to put implementation timeline here. Set priority listing for goals. In the middle of regularly passing information to legislature.
- Representation and cooperation might want to be addressed in this section.

Criteria 10.4: Describe the roles and opportunities for involvement of all agencies in the implementation of the statewide plan.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this draft.

Criteria 10.5: Establish a plan for identifying, developing, and overseeing operational requirements, SOPs, training, technical solutions, and short- and long-term funding sources.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this draft.
- Suggestion to review the CONOPS for SOP information.

Criteria 10.6: Identify a POC responsible for implementing the plan.

- PSCC Support Office the likely designee.

Criteria 10.7: Describe critical success factors for implementation of the plan.

- This criteria is not currently addressed in this draft.
- While items are listed to be accomplished in the short- and long-term, no markings are made regarding which steps are considered “critical.”

7 Funding

Criteria 9.1: Identify committed sources of funding, or the process for identifying and securing short- and long-term funding.

- Discussion begun in this draft but could use additional details.
- Recommend including already committed funding sources in this discussion, as the workshop participants identified that some do currently exist.

Criteria 9.2: Include a plan for the development of a comprehensive funding strategy. The plan should include a process for identifying ongoing funding sources, anticipated costs, and resources needed for project management and leveraging active projects.

- Discussion that this section should contain multiple potential funding streams and future projected fund raising efforts.

APPENDIX A

- Suggestion to include the review process for the homeland security funds so that the PSCC can demonstrate their contribution to how the funds will be spent.
- Excellent location to highlight local funding accomplishments and funding challenges as well.
- Discussion to develop an on-going revenue stream that will allow for consistent sustaining funding.
- Suggestion to define the funding requirement.
- Acknowledgement that future document reviews may hinge on changes in the funding available.
- Question from the group as to whether or not to include “big ticket” local funds that are designated to establish operable platforms that future interoperability will tie into.
- Suggestion to include a “depth and breadth” discussion of the funding challenges faced at the local level (regarding legacy systems, etc.) and ensure that the proposed funding strategy addresses those challenges and concerns. Suggestion from the group to emphasize those challenges, either here or earlier in the document in the SCIP’s problem statement.
- Suggest listing specific committed sources of funding. List allocated funding and how it has been used. Consider multiple funding streams. Group suggests putting in this section what has already been committed including AIRS information.
- List on-going grant application processes. Include one-time grants. Show how you are looking at other forms of funding. Group suggests putting in review process of Homeland Security funds. Coordinated effort with local – make connection.
- Develop an on-going revenue stream, such as a liquor tax (listed in document under a bulleted item).
- Group suggests define funding requirements and review process for funding and review every six months. Reflect that activity started 7 years ago and that it is a sizeable investment.
- Suggest areas where you are struggling for funding including local problems. Make a statement that smaller jurisdictions will face this challenge. How does a small jurisdiction upgrade equipment? Locals partnering with state and federal helps locals identify where they need to go - might help them gain funding.
- Attendees suggested an overall modification to SCIP verbiage to show some of the challenges facing the statewide interoperability effort. Attendees also suggested a global verbiage change in the plan from indicating that stakeholders “shall” engage in certain initiatives to reflect that they “will” engage.